



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Cultural Development Act

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Cultural Development Act originally was introduced in the House of Representatives on July 17, 1962. Since the introduction of this bill I have received such an abundance of support and encouragement from every section of the country that I am convinced more than ever before of the need, the rightness, the timeliness, and the potential contribution to the Nation's well-being of this proposed legislation. Because of this I have today reintroduced the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD at this time a partial list of the organizations and institutions, with the officer or representative of each, which have responded favorably to me as of this time:

PARTIAL LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM ORGANIZATIONS OR INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE RESPONDED FAVORABLY TO THE BASIC PROVISIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1962 (H.R. 12560)

Legislative representative, Actors Equity Association, New York, N.Y.

Director, American Association of Museums, Washington, D.C.

General secretary, American Association of University Professors, Washington, D.C.

President, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N.Y.

President, Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill.

President, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

President, Central State College, Edmond, Okla.

President, Colorado State University.

President, Dana College, Blair, Nebr.

President and chairman, Department of English, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

President, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.

President and chairman, Department of Fine Arts, East Tennessee State College.

Assistant to the president, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

President, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

President, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

President, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

President, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.

President, Idaho State College.

President, Indiana State College.

Professor of art, Kansas State University.
President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

President, Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

President, Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn.

Acting president, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

President, Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.

President, Montana State College.
Executive secretary, National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D.C.

Dean, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, Nev.

Acting president, New Mexico Western College.

Chairman, fine arts department, Plymouth Teachers College, Plymouth, N.H.

President, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.

Vice president for academic affairs, Ohio University.

Director, Otis Art Institute of Los Angeles County, Calif.

Dean, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Assistant to the president, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

President, Regis College, Denver, Colo.

Provost and vice president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

President, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C.

President, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.

President, St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La.

Editor, "School Arts" magazine.

President, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

President, State College of Iowa.

President and director, art education division, State University College, Buffalo, N.Y.

Acting president, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.

President, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

Executive secretary, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

President, the Pennsylvania State University.

Dean, the University of Oklahoma.

Heads, Departments of Journalism and Creative Writing, and Speech and Drama, University of Alaska.

Chancellor, University of California.

President, University of Illinois.

Vice chancellor and dean of faculties, University of Kansas.

Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.

President, University of Oregon.

President and dean of arts and sciences, University of South Carolina.

Dean, University of Tennessee.

President, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Dean, Utah State University.

Chairman, Humanities Division, Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kans.

Chairman, Department of Music, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

President, Western Illinois University.

President, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

President, Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.

President, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Dean, Yale University School of Art and Architecture, New Haven, Conn.

President, University of Arizona.

President and chancellor, the University of California.

Provost, the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

President, University of Texas.

President and chairman, English Department, East Texas State College.

President, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.

Vice president, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Vice president and dean, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.

President, Delaware State College, Dover, Del.

President, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

President, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.

President, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn.

President, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.

President, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.

President, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

President, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the response of the higher education community to the proposals contained in the bill has been overwhelmingly favorable. It is evident that the need for programs such as those contained in the legislation is very keenly felt by the heads of colleges and universities and other educators generally throughout the country. We are indeed facing the danger of a critical imbalance in our education programs unless we begin to give attention to the arts and humanities at least in some small measure comparable to that now being given to the sciences and technology.

I am reinforced in my conviction that this legislation is needed by the fact that, while some have suggested changes in emphasis, functions or organization, not a single dissenting voice has been raised as far as the primary objectives of the bill are concerned. It is also significant to note that coming as they do from all sections of the country and representing

many facets of the education community, they are almost unanimous in emphasizing that the Federal Government must act to support the arts and humanities to a far greater degree than heretofore.

Among the foremost supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University. On February 7, 1962, Dr. Keeney wrote me as follows:

It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

It was President Keeney's letter that stimulated my interest to introduce the proposed Cultural Development Act of 1962:

Again in response to the proposed legislation, Dr. Keeney has advised me in his letter of October 7, 1962, as follows:

I am very much pleased that you have taken the leadership in another important area and I hope very much that your efforts will succeed. If I can help, I should like to.

Another staunch supporter of the proposed legislation is Francis H. Horn, president of the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Horn has written me in part as follows in his letter of August 16, 1962:

As I think you know, I have been concerned about the advancement of the arts and humanities for many years. * * * So all I can say is, keep fighting for this good cause. * * * in the end the logic of your position, and the need for the services which your legislation provides, will win the necessary support. * * * the possibility that the Office of Education will be working on a major program in this area adds considerably to the attractiveness of the matter * * *.

Many other Rhode Islanders prominent in the arts and education have indicated their strong support. Among these are Francis Madeira, musical director of our Rhode Island Philharmonic Orchestra; Arian Coolidge, chairman of the department of music at Brown University; Louis Pichierri, director of music for our department of public schools in Providence; and John Nicholas Brown, renowned Providence art patron and collector.

In an article in the Providence Journal-Bulletin of July 17, 1962, under the heading, "College Heads Praise Humanities Move," other outstanding Rhode Island educators voiced their support. William C. Gaige, president of Rhode Island College, was quoted as follows:

Such an agency is important to put back into balance the emphasis on science and the humanities. * * * It is extremely important that we understand the nature of man, and keep in balance the educational and cultural forces which society makes available to him, and which so much influence his thinking, and through him the society of our country and of the world.

Albert Bush-Brown, president of the Rhode Island School of Design, was quoted in these words:

We ought to have an agency that is supporting performing arts through established institutions in local communities. At this time when our thinking is directed to space programs, communications systems, new power sources and computers, we have tended to neglect the necessity to reshape the communities in which we live. Unless our physical environment is qualitatively improved to sustain the social and cultural institutions that families need we shall have gained little by touching down on other planets.

Typical of the support for the objectives of this measure given by the Rhode Island press is the editorial of June 22, 1962, in the Providence Visitor, which makes an effective analysis of the objectives and need for the legislation. It also gives clear evidence of the wisdom of placing this new responsibility within the U.S. Office of Education. The entire editorial, entitled "Support for Arts and Humanities," is submitted for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, June 22, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Speaking at the commencement of Rhode Island College earlier this month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. As envisioned by Mr. FOGARTY, this Institute would stand on an equal footing with the National Science Foundation. Its functions would include supporting research, providing a national clearinghouse for educational materials, and developing a program of fellowships for students in the arts or the humanities. In addition, there would be established a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities. The members of this council would be chosen for their eminence and would advise the Government as to the ways in which it might encourage the development of the cultural life of the Nation.

We believe that this proposal has great merit, although some might question the advisability of Mr. FOGARTY's plan to set up the new Institute within the U.S. Office of Education. It should, however, be noted that this office has undergone important structural changes. Under Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, a former professor of philosophy, the horizons of the U.S. Office of Education have widened considerably beyond the traditional function of compiling educational statistics. More and more in recent years we have seen a closer communication between the academic world of humanistic studies and the creative world of the various arts. The moment that one realizes that each art has its laws and its disciplines, it becomes clear that as the Committee on the Visual Arts of Harvard University put it, "The great artist is great both as an artist and as an intellectual." The relation between the performing arts, such as music and drama, and the world of education has also long been recognized.

It is, of course, true that the history of the relations between Government and cultural pursuits has not been altogether without causes for criticism in those instances where that relation has taken on an official character. Recent discussions of the shortcomings of our own State legislature in this regard come immediately to mind. Yet we have many examples of Government activity in cultural matters that are most excellent illustrations of how things can be done with due regard to the highest professional standards. The National Gallery of Art combines

public and private efforts very well, and the Library of Congress has long been an important center of artistic and scholarly activity. If the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation can be maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there is no reason why we cannot also have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

As Mr. FOGARTY pointed out, there is a growing concern among scientists and educators over the danger of the loss of important creative human values as a result of an overemphasis on science. The Soviet Union has abandoned what we know as the liberal arts educational program. Its technically proficient dictatorship fears the liberating power of the humanities. An American institute devoted to cultural interests would further mark the difference between tyranny and freedom in the nuclear age.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the July 27, 1962, edition of the Visitor, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support of the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, July 27, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN CULTURE

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College last month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. Sharing Mr. FOGARTY's concern over the imbalance which has developed as a result of necessary stress on science in education, we expressed our general approval of the Congressman's proposal. Now that he has introduced a bill to make his plan a practical reality, we are pleased to note that such leading educators as the president of Brown University have expressed their belief that this kind of legislation is welcome. Certain matters of the public good are involved to such a wide extent that it is not surprising to find that the idea of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities does have the backing of men who know our educational and cultural needs. The vast sums of money and the abundant graduate awards which have been made available to science students are, no doubt, fully justified by the defense needs and other requirements of our society. Students who wished to prepare themselves through the equally long, difficult, and expensive processes of the humanities have, however, been offered very little such aid, when compared with the grants available in the sciences.

One consequence of this imbalance has been a decline in the enrollments in art and music schools. Another result of the heavy aid given to science has been that the number of Ph. D. candidates preparing to take their places as teachers in higher education has not kept pace with the Nation's projected needs. The American Historical Association, for example, recently pointed out that there will not be enough qualified Ph. D.'s in history alone to meet the expected needs of higher education in 1966. Under the graduate fellowships provisions of Mr. FOGARTY's Cultural Development Act, this situation would be at least partially improved.

But it is not only in the world of the universities that there is need for programs of information, advisory service, and financial help on a national scale. Statistics show that more of our people are going to concerts and other productions of the performing arts than ever before. More visitors are venturing into the Nation's museums. Both museums and producers of artistic enter-

prises are, however, finding that getting money to cover their operating expenses—to say nothing of their expansion—is increasingly difficult. The time is long past when the world of the arts was the special preserve of wealthy patrons. Cities and universities alike, faced with the fact that many of our libraries are increasingly inadequate and obsolete, cannot expect to meet the costs of the future with the help of private donors alone. Mr. FOGARTY's bill at least makes a start in facing these difficulties. More tax relief to wealthy art patrons, as proposed by the Providence Evening Bulletin is no solution. Museums and libraries which have been the special preserves of a few wealthy donors in the past are, in some instances, barely surviving today.

Mr. FOGARTY's plan was criticized by the Evening Bulletin as an attempt to buy culture for the American people, with the Government setting the critical standards. Not only does the bill specifically prohibit Federal interference of this kind, but it also assumes that we already have a culture which deserves public recognition and support.

These comments so far have focused on the strong support of this proposed legislation in behalf of the arts and humanities by key persons, organizations, and institutions within the State of Rhode Island. However, support from the other geographical areas of the Nation has been equally enthusiastic.

Chancellor York, of the University of California, has put it this way:

As for myself, I find your bill and the proposal for a national organization of arts and humanities a most encouraging step forward. It is important that the welfare of arts and humanities be taken seriously, for we cannot continually perpetuate and seek a high standard of excellence in the sciences to the exclusion of other areas of learning. I am convinced that a balance must be struck between the technical and the arts and humanities that will provide this country with well-rounded individuals whose abilities in any given area have only been enhanced by their knowledge of, and education in, the arts and humanities. Your bill also lends itself to the furtherance of the arts and humanities, by assuring, through scholarships and fellowships, the education of those persons pursuing study in these areas. This is a strong point in its favor.

Dean Peltason, of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of the University of Illinois, confirms the existence at his institution of a situation which we know to be widespread throughout the country. Here is the way Dean Peltason describes it:

What is happening is that the availability of research support for the sciences, as much as it is welcomed, is forcing the universities to divert more and more of their own resources to the sciences at the expense of the other areas of our concern. Not only is this because we must divert university resources to cover indirect costs of Government-sponsored science research, but since matching funds are available for science buildings and programs, there is an unavoidable tendency to give these items high priorities.

In addition, research support for science is creating even greater disparities in the rewards to scientists in contrast to those working in fields where Federal funds are not available. Research grants permit scientists to acquire equipment they need and to attend international conferences. Scientists are paid during summer months to do

research. Scholars in other fields do not have these opportunities so that in effect the salary of almost every university scientist is at least two-ninths more than that of comparable scholars in other fields.

The president of Trinity College, Washington, D.C., has pointed out that we must be concerned with "the development of a man as man, as a human person"; and further, that "our architecture, music, sculpture, literature and painting must represent the very best of which we are capable, just as our scientific development does."

President Hart of Duke University has written to me, stating:

I think it is highly important for the student, the universities and the country as a whole that the humanities not be neglected in our emphasis on the sciences.

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has responded to the presentation of my bill in the Congress in the following words:

The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

Stanley A. Czurlies, president of the Eastern Arts Association, representing some 3,000 art educators in the northeastern part of the United States, has recorded that organization's support of my bill. He has called it "very realistic in its approach to the problem" and "in line with several developments which institutions and organizations working in the art field have been seeking to bring about."

On a broader scale, the National Council of the Arts in Education, representing over 150,000 persons concerned with the arts at all levels of education, has recently concluded the first National Conference on the Arts in Education at Lake Erie College in Painesville, Ohio. Dean Norman L. Rice, of the College of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute of Technology, who served as chairman of this conference, has recently written to the U.S. Office of Education as follows:

Of major importance to the conference was a realization of the urgent necessity for strong, enlightened Federal support in the arts. Indeed, this need may be said to have occupied the prime position in the conference's survey of the arts today.

Dean Rice goes on to present specific recommendations from the Council in the areas of conferences, research, services of specialists, and publication in the field of the arts. Each one of these needs would be met under the provision of this bill.

President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, has written to me in these words:

The purposes intended by your bill are of great importance to our national life which can most surely advance with security and strength only if we develop the full potentials of our intellectual resources, both humane and scientific.

Dean J. A. Burdine of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas has stated:

Representative FOGARTY's bill to create a National Institute of Arts and Humanities represents an excellent balance to the imbalance that has been created by the recent emphasis on science. It seems to me that the heart of the matter is the provision for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded to outstanding students.

Dean E. W. Doty, of the College of Fine Arts of the same university, has made the following comment concerning this proposed legislation:

Of all the bills which have been introduced which I have studied, this seems a more fruitful approach than trying to set up a separate national agency.

The chairman of the music department at Washington University in St. Louis sums up his conviction this way:

The arts are no longer a frill or the preoccupation of a fringe group of eccentrics; rather, they are basic, fundamental to meaningful living in the contemporary world.

He further states that—

only the Federal Government can attack the problems of the arts on a scale large enough and at a level high enough to be meaningful and effective.

And of course, this is the fundamental need which my bill proposes to meet. However, while it is broad and flexible enough to attack the needs and problems in the arts at the Federal level, my bill provides specifically that there shall be no Federal control over the policies and the functions of the institutions, organizations, associations, and individuals which it seeks to assist.

At this point, I should like to submit for the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Providence Evening Bulletin which appeared on August 1, 1962. It was written by Dr. Gustav O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, in reply to the Bulletin's editorial of July 20 entitled, "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies." This letter makes several facts abundantly clear. First, the enlightened scientist agrees that full value and support must be given to our artistic, literary, and scholarly efforts as a Nation if our science itself is to reach its fullest potential. Second, the gross disparity in relative support by our educational institutions of scientific programs on one hand, and of programs in the arts and humanities on the other, has been heightened by our own actions in the Congress in behalf of our defense, as essential as these have been. And finally, the experience in recent years of educational institutions which have received substantial Federal support through agencies such as AEC, NIH, NSF, and NDEA proves beyond question that Federal assistance is possible without Federal control.

THE COUNCIL OF
GRADUATE SCHOOLS
IN THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1962.

To the Editor,
Providence Evening Bulletin,
Providence, R.I.

Your editorial of Friday, July 20, 1962, entitled "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies," requires a reply, not so much to let you and your readers know that the universities and colleges of the country heartily support Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY'S Cultural Development Act of 1962, but chiefly to point out certain distortions of fact and erroneous conclusions in the editorial.

I need not waste time and space to prove that a great imbalance exists in favor of the natural sciences over the humanities. You yourself admit it. But I do wish to quote a few sentences from the now-famous Seaborg Report of November 15, 1960, a statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee.

"Much of the basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning * * *. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report."

These sentences were not written by Representative FOGARTY or by a professor of arts or humanities, but by 14 of the most distinguished scientists of the Nation. Granted that the expenditure of vast sums in the advancement of the sciences was dictated by the needs of national defense, the fact remains that this advancement was accomplished by the impoverishment of the arts and the humanities. This impoverishment resulted not only from the direct absence of Federal support but also from the fact that many universities have had to siphon off funds from their arts and humanities programs to pay the indirect costs of federally sponsored science programs. In other words, the imbalance which exists today was created both directly and indirectly by the Federal Government.

I am sure that you must have had tongue in cheek when you wrote that the remedy for the plight of the humanities and the arts lies on the campus of each college along with the responsibility for poorly trained teachers. Even a professor of the arts or humanities has to be paid—not as much as a chemist, to be sure—and he needs space, equipment, books, museum materials. Who is going to buy these necessities when the budgets of humanities departments are cut to the bone to provide overhead costs for the sciences?

No, Mr. Editor, the remedy for the imbalance lies with the same agency that created it—the Federal Government. And the remedy does not consist of curtailing subsidies to the sciences so that we can all be

poor and mediocre together. It consists of reasonable, not extravagant, intelligently allotted aid to the undernourished areas. Then, and only then, can the universities and colleges improve the deficiencies in their arts and humanities departments. And I don't know where you got the notion of a "crash program"—an anomalous term in itself; how can anything that crashes be constructive? Certainly there's nothing in Mr. FOGARTY'S bill to suggest a crash program.

Finally, I wish to object most strongly to your statement that this bill implies that the Government "can and should decide what has and what has not cultural value, and that it can and should shape humanities programs in American colleges." In the first place, section 102 of the bill expressly prohibits any Government supervision or control of educational policy. More impressive, however, is the record of the past. In the last 20 years, the Government has invested billions of dollars in higher education, through such agencies as AEC, NASA, NDEA, NIH, NSF, and others, and there still has to be found a single instance in which Government has attempted to formulate, supervise, control, or shape programs, curriculums, or policies of universities and colleges. Believe me, sir, we, the administrators and faculties of the universities and colleges, would be the first to raise our voices in protest against such interference.

You cannot, indeed, "buy public culture with Federal subsidies," but you can buy the personnel, the facilities, and the equipment by means of which the universities and colleges can produce the teachers and practitioners of the arts and letters in a favorable cultural climate. For the first step in this direction we thank Mr. FOGARTY.

GUSTAVE O. ARLT,
*President, the Council of Graduate
Schools in the United States.*

Financial statistics clearly show that present Federal programs in institutions of higher education are heavily weighted to the natural and physical sciences. The effects of this emphasis on these institutions has recently been analyzed in a study of 36 colleges and universities. The study was performed by Harold Orlands of the Brookings Institution under contract with the Office of Education. It is part of the "Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education." Some of the findings of this study follow:

The effects which Federal programs have had on the quality and nature of higher education have been varied and uneven: pronounced in some areas but virtually undetectable in others where one would expect a marked effect. On the whole the effects have been decidedly good.

They have been most striking and direct in scientific research and education at a few leading graduate and professional schools and institutes of technology, and most imperceptible and indirect in scholarly work and teaching in the arts and humanities at 4- and 2-year liberal arts colleges. We have not explored either the tenuous effects at the

latter institutions or the pronounced effects at professional schools of medicine, engineering, and agriculture, but have focused on the impact on liberal arts education at a broad group of public and private universities and a select group of private colleges.

Federal programs have aided these institutions to improve the quality, increase the numbers, improve the salaries, and reduce the teaching loads of their faculty in the sciences and some social sciences * * *.

Perhaps the most unfortunate consequence of Federal science programs has been the cleavage they have engendered between the status and rewards of faculty in the sciences and humanities. Surely this is the major problem posed for educational institutions by the unbalanced nature of present Federal policies and expenditures, and it suggests the desirability of either counterbalancing programs in the humanities or of broader forms of institutional aid.

Faculty members in the 36 institutions were asked their opinion on the wide difference in Federal support between the sciences and humanities. Their response follows:

A small majority of scientists believe that the concentration of Federal funds in the natural sciences and relative neglect of the humanities is in the present national interest, but over two-thirds of the social scientists and a still larger proportion of humanists affirm that it is not. Some 70 percent of the scientists, however, state that the present pattern is neither in the long-run national interest nor in the best interest of their institution, and nine-tenths or more of their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities agree.

Asked further, "If you could redistribute the Federal funds presently available, what would you do?" over 70 percent of the respondents indicate that they would, "Give the humanities somewhat more and the sciences somewhat less, but still the major portion." It is worthy of special note that 67 percent of the scientists at universities now receiving the largest sums from the Federal Government also subscribe to this position, and the comments of many suggest that an even larger proportion would favor a policy which gave both humanists and scientists more money, or at any rate which did not penalize the sciences in order to help the humanities.

In summary, I would say only this: Seldom, if ever, in my experience as a legislator, have I observed a more clearly felt need for appropriate legislation such as that represented by the comments and convictions of these leaders in the fields of the arts, sciences, and the humanities which I have shared with you in part. I believe my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, makes a comprehensive yet reasonable beginning of Federal support in this area. I feel certain the Congress will accept this nationwide surge of united opinion as an unequivocal mandate for forthright action.